

REMARKS

Claims 13 and 33-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Claim 13 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Regarding claims 33-37, the rejection states, in part, that “(c)laim(s) 33 fail(s) to recite sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define the interlock portion so that an integral structure able to function as claimed is recited.” Claim 33 is directed to a table top comprising an interior frame, corner blocks including a rigidifying member, interlock portions, a corner portion, a first end rail, a first side rail, a second end rail, a cellular core, end rails and an exterior shell. Claim 33 includes many phrases relating the structural and functional aspects of the claimed elements. The specification includes an explanation (in conjunction with the drawings) showing each of the claimed elements. Claims are considered to satisfy the requirements in the second paragraph of 112 if they define the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter with a reasonable degree of precision and particularity.¹ It is submitted that there is no requirement to define “an integral structure” and sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements is recited. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 33-37 is, respectfully, requested.

Claims 1, 13 and 32 stand rejected as anticipated by Clark et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,837,171). Claim 1 has been amended to include that the at least one block includes a first side block and a corner block, the first side block coupled to the first side rail and arranged to lie in spaced-apart relation to the corner block, the corner block coupled to adjacent ends of a side rail and an end rail. Clark et al. does not include a corner block and for at least this reason does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 1. As noted above, claim 13 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claim 32 remains dependent on claim 1 and avoids Clark et al. for at least the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 17 stands rejected as obvious over Clark et al.. Claim 17 remains dependent on claim 1 and avoids Clark et al. for at least the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the elected claims (Nos. 1-12, 14-17 and 32-37) are in condition for allowance and such action is, respectfully, requested.

¹ See *In re Venezia*, 530 F.2d 956, 958, 189 USPQ 149, 151 (CCPA 1976) and *In re Hammack*, 427 F.2d 1378, 166 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1970).

If there is any issue remaining to be resolved, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that resolution can be promptly effected.

It is requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response with the fee for such extensions and shortages in other fees, being charged, or any overpayment in fees being credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 10-0435 (20341-73747).

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Richard B. Lazarus".

Richard B. Lazarus

Reg. No. 48,215

Tel. No. (202) 371-6348